# File#;

105-ST-0

# Serial Scope:

4900 4mm 4901A

Released under the John F. Mennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 (44 YBC 2107 Note). Case=:NW 54948 Date: 11-16-2017

	TO: SAC:    Albany	
* THE TENTE OF THE	RE: SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE	
-	RE: SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE Date 11/21/75 ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES 0-490	
A THE TAXABLE SAFETY OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	Retention For appropriate  For information optional action Surep, by  The enclosed is for your information. If used in a future report, conceal all sources, paraphrase contents.  Enclosed are corrected pages from report of SA dated  Remarks:	
00000 00000 00000 00000	Enclosed for your information is a copy of an article by Mr. William Safire entitled "Mr. Church's Cover-Up" that appeared in the November 20, 1975, issue of "The New York Times."    Church's Cover-Up" that appeared in the New York Times.	

## Mr. Church's Cover-Up

#### By William Safire

WASHINGON, Nov. 19—On Oct. 10, 1963, the then-Attorney General of the United States put his personal signature on a document that launched and legitimatized one of the most horrendous abuses of Federal police power in this century.

In Senator Frank Church's subcommittee hearing room this week, the authorized wiretapping and subsequent unauthorized bugging and attempted blackmailing of Martin Luther King Jr. is being gingerly examined, with the "investigation" conducted in such a way as not to unduly embarrass officials of the Kennedy or Johnson Administrations.

With great care, the committee has focused on the F.B.I. Yesterday, when the committee counsel first set forth the result of shuffling through press clips, it seemed as if no Justice Degratment had existed in 1962; today, an F.B.I. witness pointed out that it was Robert Kennedy who authorized the wiretap of Dr. King, and that "the President of the United States and the Attorney General specifically discussed their concern of Communist influence with Dr. King,"

But the Church committee showed no zest for getting further to the Kennedy root of this precedent to Watergate eavesdropping. If Senator Church were willing to let the chips fall where they may, he would call some knowledgeable witnesses into the glare of the camera lights and ask them-some questions that have gone unasked for thirteen years.

For example, he could call Nicholas Katzenbach, Attorney General Kennedy's deputy and successor, and ask what he knows of the Kennedy decision to wiretap Dr. King. Who at Justice concurred in the recommendation? How does the F.B.I. know the President was consulted or informed?

After Mr. Katzenbach assumed office, and the wiretapping continued, he was told by angry newsmen that the F.B.I. was leaking scurrilous information about Dr. King. Why did he wait for four months, and for a thousand telephonic interceptions, to discontinue the officially approved tap?

Of course, this sort of testimony would erode Senator Church's political base. That is why we do not see former Assistant F.B.I. director Cartha (Deke) Deloach, Lyndon Johnson's personal contact with the F.B.I. in the witness chair. What did President Johnson know about the characterassassination piot and when did he know it? What conversations took place between Mr. Deloach and President Johnson on the tapping of Dr. King, or about the use of the F.B.I. in any other intrusions into the lives of pelitical figures?

The committee is not asking embarrassing questions even when answers are readily available. A couple of weeks ago, at an open hearing, an F.B.I. man inadvertently started to blurt out an episode about newsmen who were weritapping in 1962 with the apparent knowledge of Attorney General Kennedy. The too-willing witness was promptly shooshed into siglence, and told that such information would be developed only in executive session. Nobody raised an eyebrow.

That pattern of containment by the Church committee is vividly shown by the handling of the buggings at the 1964 Republican and Democratic con-

### **ESSAY**

ventions which were ordered by Lyndon Johnson. Such invasions of political headquarters were worse than the crime committed at Watergate, since they involved the use of the F.B.I., but the Church investigators seem to be determined not to probe too deeply.

If F.B.I. documents say that reports were made to specific Johnson aides, why are those men not given the same opportunity to publicly tell their story so avidly given the next President's men? If Lyndon Johnson committed this impeachable high crime of using the F.B.I. to spy on political opponents, who can be brought forward to tell us all about it?

But that would cause embarrassment to Democrats. and Senator Church wants to embarrass professional employees of investigatory agencies only. A new sense of Congressional decorum exists, far from the sense of outrage expressed in the Senate Watergate committee's hearing room. When it is revealed that the management of NBC News gave press credentials to L.B.J.'s spies at the 1964 convention, everybody blushes demurely—and nobody demands to know which network executive made what decision urder what pressure.

I have been haranguing patient readers for years about the double standard applied to Democratic and Republican political crimes, and had hoped the day would come when the hardball precedents set by the Kennedy and Johnson men would be laid before the public in damning detail.

Obviously, Democrat Frank Church is not the man to do it. His jowlshaking indignation is all too selective; the trail of high-level responsibility for the crimes committed against Dr. King and others is evidently going to be allowed to cool.

Pity. You'd think that after all the nation has been through in the past few years, our political leaders would have learned that the one thing that brings you down is the act of covering up.

THE NEW YORK TIMES
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20th,1975
PAGE C-41

NR ØØ3 SJ CODE 10:06 PM NITEL 3-25-75 JXC

TO DIRECTOR

ATTENTION: BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING SECTION FROM SAN JUAN.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

REFERENCE BUREAU TELETYPE TO ALL SPECIAL AGENTS IN CHARGE DATED MARCH 24. 1975. CAPTIONED AS ABOVE.

THE FOLLOWING IS A BREAKDOWN OF SUPERVISOR AND AGENT
PERSONNEL IN THE SAN JUAN DIVISION ASSIGNED TO INTERNAL SECURITY
MATTERS:

ONE SUPERVISOR - FULL TIME; ONE SUPERVISOR - TWENTY PER CENT OF THE TIME; FOURTEEN SPECIAL AGENTS - FULL TIME; THREE SPECIAL AGENTS - FIFTY PER CENT OF THE TIME.

AT THIS TIME, THE SAN JUAN DIVISION HAS NO COUNTERINTELLI-GENCE MATTERS IN A PENDING STATUS; THEREFORE, NO AGENT PERSONNEL ARE ASSIGNED TO COUNTERINTELLIGENCE. END.

DBS FBIHQ ACK FOR ONE GA

big to FBIHG

Pent to Pallas

185-8-4901

EMALIZED FILE MEE

LEMAN F. FILE

FBI — SAN JUAN

NR 046 WA CODE

10:22PM NITEL 3-24-75 DEB

TO ALL SACS

FROM DIRECTOR

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SENATOR FRANK CHURCH, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE SELECT

COMMITTEE TO STUDY GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS WITH RESPECT TO

INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES HAS MADE AN INITIAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

FROM THE FBI. AMONG THE ITEMS REQUESTED IS A BREAKDOWN OF

FIELD AGENT PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO INTERNAL SECURITY AND

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE MATTERS.

ACCORDINGLY, WITHIN FOUR EIGHT HOURS EACH SAC SHOULD SUTEL

TO FBIHQ, ATTENTION: BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING SECTION, SETTING FORTH

SEPARATELY THE NUMBER OF SACS, ASACS, SUPERVISORS AND AGENTS ASSIGNED

TO INTERNAL SECURITY AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE MATTERS. PERCENTAGES

OF AN AGENT'S TIME, WHEN NOT ASSIGNED FULL- IME TO THESE ACTIVITIES,

SHOULD BE USED IF APPROPRIATE, PARTICULARLY IN THE SUPERVISORY

CATEGORIES. THIS INFORMATION SHOULD BE BROKEN DOWN SEPARATELY

BETWEEN INTERNAL SECURITY AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE. YOUR RESPONSE SHOULD

BE LIMITED TO AGENT PERSONNEL ONLY.

E ND

IX C FRICI CA

105 -4900 ADDREED - 1NDEXED

FDI CAN

NW 54948 DocId:32989486 Page 5